

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1 - 20 are currently pending in this application. All of the Claims were rejected in a Final Office Action dated November 13, 2006. No new matter has been added.

II. Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,895,588 to Ruberg ("Ruberg"). Also, Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 - 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruberg in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0043702 to Elteto et al. ("Elteto"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 teaches a method for detecting the attachment of a shared resource to a server, querying if the shared resource is associated with a share indicator stored at the server, and if the share indicator is present, then applying a share allocation associated with the share indicator to the shared resource.

In contrast, Ruberg merely notes that the device manager "should be aware that devices could be connected, disconnected, or moved while the desktop unit is functioning and while being controlled by a service" (column 5, lines 29 - 32 of Ruberg). In the case of shared resources, Ruberg fails to specifically disclose Applicants' claimed share indicator that is stored at the server, or any similar mechanism for maintaining information about a share allocation at the server following the detachment of the shared resource from the server.

Rather, Ruberg teaches that devices are brokered by a device manager that is responsible for maintaining inventories of devices and their controlling services, and that controls accessibility of

users to user programs by controlling the accessibility of devices to services (see, e.g., column 5, lines 10 - 65 of Ruberg). Ruberg further discloses that a connection to a device may be established using "standard session management services" (see, e.g., column 5, lines 65 - 67 of Ruberg). Ruberg also notes that current peripheral bus architectures suggest that the device manager must support "hot plugging" of devices (column 5, lines 26 - 32). As a result, Ruberg must be presumed to comply with prior art systems (for example, as described at pages 1, 2, paragraph [0002], lines 8 - 16 of Applicants' specification) that require shares to be reallocated by an administrator or administrative function upon reconnecting a recognized shared device to a server unit.

As Ruberg fails to disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' invention as claimed in independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is neither anticipated nor made obvious by the cited reference. Furthermore, since independent Claim 7 is substantially similar to Claim 1 in some ways, albeit different in other ways, Claim 7 is novel and non-obvious for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

In regard to independent Claim 13, it teaches a system for storing a descriptor table with an entry identifying share allocation for a known storage free device, and storing a shared resource table to identify a share allocation of shared devices, wherein a share file is automatically created in the shared resource table for an unknown device which enables identification and automatic allocation of sharing for the unknown device. (see, e.g., page 3, line 11 - page 4, line 6 of Applicants' specification).

In contrast to Claim 13, Ruberg's device manager requires shared resources to be reallocated by an administrator or administrative function upon reconnecting a recognized shared device to a server unit. No mention is made of the novel use of two separate tables to enable identification and automatic allocation for sharing of an unknown device. Thus, since Ruberg fails to suggest or teach at least one novel and non-obvious aspect of Claim 13, this claim is allowable. Furthermore, since independent Claim 19 is substantially similar to Claim 13 in some ways, albeit different in other ways, Claim 19 is novel and non-obvious for at least the same reasons as Claim 13.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that none of independent Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are anticipated or made obvious by Ruberg, and that these claims are therefore each in condition for allowance. As each of Claims 2 - 6, 8 - 12, 14 - 18 and 20 depends from one of allowable independent Claims 1, 7, 13 or 19, their respective dependent claims 2 - 6, 8 - 12, 14 - 18 and 20 are also novel and non-obvious in view of Ruberg or the suggested combination of Ruberg with Elteto.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance as to all pending claims be issued in this case.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: January 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8906 • (212) 527-7701 fax

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant